



Carlos Alvarez, Mayor

Procurement Management
111 NW 1st Street • Suite 1300
Miami, Florida 33128-1974
T 305-375-5289 F 305-375-4407 305-372-6128

miamidade.gov

ADDENDUM NO. 5

DATE: June 9, 2010

TO: ALL PROSPECTIVE PROPOSERS

SUBJECT: Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 725
METRORAIL CONTROL CENTER UPGRADE

The following constitutes Addendum No. 5.

MODIFICATIONS:

1. Attachment A - Technical Spec Part 1, Division 1 – General Requirements, Section 01 10 00 - General Summary of Work, Article 1.2-Supplemental Documents to include the following documents attached hereto:
 - Section 1.2.C Electronic Sign Information System specification as Attachment # 1.
 - Section 1.2.D Metrorail Operation Rules and Procedures Manual – Attachment #2.
 - Section 1.2.E MDT MIC-EHT Contract Division 50 - Technical Provision - Attachment #3.
 - Section 1.2.H MDT FEP Database MDT 416-2DP - Central MTU MODBUS Read/Write Database - Attachment #4.
2. Attachment E Form B1- Price Proposal Schedule is deleted in its entirety and replaced with a revised Attachment E Form B1- Price Proposal Schedule as Attachment #5.
3. Attachment D – Proposer Information is deleted in its entirety and replaced with a revised Attachment D issued via this addendum as Attachment #6.
4. Article 1.1 of RFP - Project Overview & General Terms and Conditions – Introduction: Deadline for receipt of questions is June 18, 2010, close of business.
5. Attachment A - Technical Spec Part 1, Division 1 – General Requirements, Section 01 10 00, General Summary of Work, Article 1.4.C.3 – Phases is deleted in its entirety.

QUESTIONS/ANSWERS

Q1. Appendix 3 of the subject RFP documents contains the "MDT Project Schedule". However, we note that the subject master schedule shows a "Run Date" of March 7, 2008 and is using data of February 2008. Is there an Updated Master Schedule which better reflects current and near term events, activity durations and dates?

A1. We have an updated schedule document that shows the estimated dates and durations of major project activities, however this schedule document was not intended to be included in the RFP package. The Proposer (Design-Builder) is required to prepare its own project schedules as required by the RFP.

Q2. In Attachment A – Technical Specifications - Section 01 10 00 – Paragraph 1.2 SUPPLEMENTAL DOCUMENTS, reference is made to a series of 8 technical documents.

These documents do not appear to be available in the website and are necessary to understand the full scope of the work required.

Where can we find this documentation?

A2. For the 8 technical documents listed in:

Section 1.2.A Engineering Contract Drawings - Provided in Addendum 3.

Section 1.2.B Reference Drawings with I/O Datapoint listing - Provided in Addendum 3.

Section 1.2.C Electronic Sign Information System Specification - Include the TrainTracker System Diagram-REV2.pdf. - Provided via this addendum as Attachment No. 1.

Section 1.2.D Metrorail Operation Rules and Procedures Manual - Provided via this addendum as Attachment No. 2.

Section 1.2.E MDT MIC-EHT Contract Div 50 Technical Provision - Provided via this addendum as Attachment No. 3.

Section 1.2.F MDT Mainline Service Manual 6278 - Provided in Addendum 3.

Section 1.2.G MDT Compendium of Design Criteria - Provided in Addendum 3.

Section 1.2.H MDT FEP Database MDT 416_2DP - Central MTU MODBUS Read/Write Database - Available Database information is provided via this addendum as attachment 4).

Q3. What is the architecture of the PLCs? As we understand it there is one central PLC and another in each station.

Can these PLCs be reprogrammed?

Do the PLCs in the stations receive data from the contiguous PLCs?

A3. 1) Refer to RFP Attachment A Part 1, Division 1 - General requirements, Technical Specifications SECTION 02 00 00 - EXISTING CONDITIONS and CONTRACT DRAWINGS- DWG 006 through DWG 012 provided in Addendum 3.

2) The Master PLC at central is to be replaced with a concentrator for this project. See CONTRACT DRAWING - DWG 008 through DWG 012 provided in Addendum 3.

3) No - Station PLCs communicate to Master PLC at Central only. See CONTRACT DRAWING- DWG 008 through DWG 012 provided in Addendum 3.

Q4. What interface does the Cyberlock system have?

Is there a published API which allows integration at the application level?

What licensing issues will be involved in interfacing with the system?

- A4. 1) Cyberlock equipment communicates to central Cyberlock workstation at Central (4th floor security room) over the Enterprise network. Interfacing with this equipment is not part of this project. Transport of Cyberlock data over the Enterprise Network shall be maintained.
2) No integration with Cyberlock system is required for this project.
3) No licensing issues. MDT maintains the licenses.
- Q5. How must we integrate with the ESIS (Electronic Signage Information System)?

What is the interface with the Train Control - Train Tracker System? Is there a published protocol
- A5. Refer to CONTRACT DRAWING - DWG 015 provided in Addendum 3, and drawing titled "TrainTracker System Diagram-REV2.pdf" provided in this Addendum (Refer to Attachment No. 1).
- Q6. How must we integrate with the CAD/AVL System?

What is the interface with the Train Control - Train Tracker System? Is there a published protocol?
- A6. No CAD/AVL System interface requirements at this time. Contractor is to provide additional console space for future equipment to be provided by others. At each workstation location, console space shall be provided for three additional workstation PCs, monitors, keyboard, and mouse. This additional space is to accommodate the Harris C3 Maestro Dispatch Console with one monitor and the CAD/AVL workstation (Make and Model - TBD) with two monitors. All console monitors for this project and others must comply with the new MDT standard of 24" Widescreen.
- Q7. If the \$500,000 allowance for spare parts is not part of the main contract total, does this mean that this value is not included in the calculations for the DBE value or the Performance Bond?
- A7. Attachment E Form B1- Price Proposal Schedule will be deleted in its entirety and replaced with a revised Attachment E - Form B1- Price Proposal Schedule, issued via this addendum as Attachment No. 5, to remove the Spare Parts Allowance from the Base Price Proposal. Further, an Allowance Account for System Spare Parts of \$500,000 will be included in the Price Summary Form as a fixed allowance account outside of the Base Price Proposal. Since it is understood that any unspent portion of the allowance account is to remain with the County, only funds expended towards the purchase of spare parts will be credited towards the DBE goals established for this project.
- Q8. Where should the costs related to insurance, Performance Bonds, etc be included?

In the breakout costs shown in the Pricing Schedule these do not appear anywhere.
- A8. No separate measurement of payment will be made for Insurance, Bonds or Mobilization. These project expenses will be paid for as part of the overall Base Price Proposal and shall be included and prorated throughout the 12 items contained in the Base Price Proposal.
- Q9. Please reference Attachment D - Proposer Information, Minimum Qualification Requirements. The majority of the listed of technical certifications seem most applicable to a traditional A&E firm and this is understandable as the design for the new Control Room is to be completed as part of the project. However, it appears that the bulk of the work of the project will be performed by the Control System Supplier / Integrator. The specified certification requirements for the Prime Proposer a) may preclude qualified systems integrators from serving as the Prime Proposer thus introducing an intermediary firm between the Department and the Company most responsible for the successful outcome of the project and b) may limit the number of responsive proposals. Would the Department consider allowing all of the listed technical certifications to be met by the Proposer or one of its subcontractor's instead of requiring the Prime Proposer to have technical certifications 2.01 and 17.00?

- A9. Please see revised Attachment D for RFP.
- Q10. What is the rationale for requiring that the proposer/prime contractor on this RFP be a technically certified firm under 2.01 Mass Transit Systems – Mass Transit Program (Systems) Management and 17.00 Engineering Construction Management? Please confirm that this requirement can be eliminated, or that a subcontractor on the team can be used to fulfill these requirements (as with the other technical certification requirements) as opposed to having to be the proposer?
- A10. Technical certification requirements were modified via this addendum, refer to Modification No. 3 and Attachment No. 6.
- Q11. Can you please remove the technical certification requirement for Sub 15.01 Surveying and Mapping-land surveying and Sub 16.00 General Civil Engineering? As confirmed by the project manager at the pre proposal conference these trades are not needed as part of the scope of work, and should not be required as part of the teams technical certifications.
- A11. Technical certification requirement for Sub 15.01 Surveying and Mapping-land surveying, and Sub 16.00 General Civil Engineering, were removed from Attachment D via this addendum. Please refer to Modification No. 3 and Attachment No. 6.
- Q12. Can you please provide accurate, to scale, drawings of the all existing and proposed areas of work? During the walkthrough it was observed that the design drawings provided in the addendum do not accurately represent the actual as-built conditions (ex. Partition layouts throughout the floor are not shown correctly, control equipment size and layout is incorrect, door way locations, etc...). In order to provide a responsive and responsible price proposal we will need accurate drawings of the existing and proposed project spaces.
- A12. Refer to Reference Drawing Set Y291 Transit Control Center Plan Set Provided in Addendum No. 3.
- Q13. When can we visit the following spaces in the building: main utility rooms, the third floor, the fourth floor, and the thirtieth floor?
In order to provide a responsive and responsible price proposal we will need to visit these spaces in order to clearly understand how the proposed work will impact these areas which are impacted by the project scope of work. For example how much of the thirtieth floor is affected; how will existing ceiling and lights be affected by new mechanical systems, etc...
- A13. Site visits were scheduled. Refer to Addendum No. 4. A copy of the attendance sheets is attached as Attachment 10.
- Q14. Can you please provide us copy of the existing record “as-built” drawings of the buildings original construction (dimensioned to scale) for the Stephen P Clark building so that a professional and accurate engineering analysis can be provided for all areas, utilities, and building systems affected by the proposed projects scope of work. Drawings provided in addendum are incomplete.
- A14. Refer to Reference Drawing Set Y291 Transit Control Center Plan Set Provided in Addendum No. 3.
- Q15. We are hereby requesting an extension of time on the response due date to the RFP pending resolution of the above items. This is necessary in order to provide a responsive and responsible price proposal.
- A15. See Modification No. 4, above.
- Q16. Reference: Attachment D Proposer Information.
This attachment defines the technical certifications that must be held by the Proposer and those that must be held either by the Proposer himself or one of his subcontractors prior to the proposal submission date. Collectively, these include the following:
- 2.01 Mass Transit Program (Systems) Management

- 17.00 Engineering Construction Management
- 2.04 Mass Transit Controls, Communications & Information Systems
- 2.06 Mass Transit Safety Certification for System Elements

Among all of the signaling and train control and SCADA systems suppliers attending the pre-proposal conference; and among all other suppliers who are qualified to perform this work having successfully completed projects that are similar in nature; none currently possess any of the above certifications or any other of the technical certifications required of the Proposer by MDTA. This is according to the information found on MDTA website, URL http://www.miamidade.gov/dpm/library/oci_forms/technically_certified_firms_by_categories.pdf. All of the firms on the above referenced list appear to be consultant and professional services companies, not manufacturers or systems suppliers. That being said, we believe that it may be unreasonable to expect that all of the firms who may be interested in pursuing this bid opportunity as a Prime Contractor (and who are otherwise qualified based on their performance on similar contracts) should be expected to complete the certification process prior to the submittal date of this proposal given that there is only one certification committee meeting remaining prior to the proposal submission date. Therefore:

Would MDTA consider an extension to the current submittal date to permit more time to make application for these certifications?

- A16. No time extension to the current proposal submittal granted at this time.
- Q17. Would MDTA consider modifying the certification requirements such that the eligibility can be met if a subcontractor possesses the 17.00 Engineering Construction Management technical certification in cases where a Train Control/SCADA Systems Supplier is the Proposer/Prime Contractor?
- A17. Technical certification requirement were modified via this addendum, refer to Modification No. 3 and Attachment No. 6.
- Q18. Would MDTA consider waiving this requirement altogether and assess the qualifications of each Proposer on the basis of his/her technical submittal and project references?
- A18. Technical certification requirement were modified via this addendum, refer to Modification No. 3 and Attachment No. 6.
- Q19. Regarding the 2 Technical Certifications that are required by the Proposer (Prime), we request that this be relaxed. Specifically, we request that only the Engineering Construction Management certification be held by the Proposer and Mass Transit Program Management be held by the Proposer or one of its subcontractors.
- A19. Technical certification requirement were modified via this addendum, refer to Modification No. 3 and Attachment No. 6.
- Q20. We respectfully request a 4 week extension to the July 7, 2010 due date.
- A20. No time extension to the current proposal submittal granted at this time.
- Q21. Based on the May 19th Pre-Proposal Conference, MDT presented that the Metrorail Control Center (MRCC) contractors are responsible for the integration of the MIC-EHT system control into the new/upgraded MRCC. With regard to this component of the MRCC Upgrade, what level of integration is required for the MIC-EHT equipment into the newly provided upgrade? Is the MIC-EHT systems software to be integrated into the new/upgraded Central Control as part of the MRCC Upgrade or is the MIC-EHT system equipment provided under the MIC-EHT contract simply being located into the new control room where only console space would be provided without software integration of the two programs/projects? Please clarify the extent to which the integration should be taken and what information will be provided by Miami Dade County from the MIC-EHT project if complete software integration of the systems is to occur.

A21. Complete software integration of the mainline and the MIC-EHT connector into one unified central system is a requirement of this MRCC project. Re-use of any MIC-EHT project hardware or software is not a requirement, but will be left to the discretion of the proposer. MDT can provide any necessary documentation such as the track plan for the MIC-EHT project and information on the MIC-EHT SCADA/network equipment to interface with at the MRCC. Section 011000, 1.4.C.3, General Summary of Work was modified via this addendum, refer to Modification No. 5 and Attachment No. 1

Q22. Can you please provide a project budget which includes the 3 years of Technical Support & Warranty

A22. Metrorail Central Control Upgrade Project Cost Estimate is provided via this addendum as Attachment No. 7.

Q23. Attachment A - Technical Specifications Section 01 10 00, 1.5 Scope of Work, para H: Communication and SCADA Scope. The RFP makes the following statement about what the contractor shall provide:

The Contractor shall provide the SCADA System which shall include:

- i. Simulator workstation to be used for systems development.
- ii. 70 inch LCD panels displaying TTMS above TPSS
- iii. Front End Processors (FEP)
- iv. SCADA database and applications server 5th floor
- v. TTMS above TPSS
- vi. RS-232 concentrator on 4th floor Palmetto and Okeechobee to replace serial connection to the existing FEPs in data center
- vii. Siemens Master for other 24 stations
- viii. Interface to MIC-EH via Rail-DTS Ethernet 10 Gig Switch
- ix. T1 from Palmetto and Okeechobee bypasses A/B switch (requires manual switch over) and needs to be redesigned to provide protection for these two locations
- x. Replace
- xi. PSDs
- xii. Recortec FEPs
- xiii. Master PLCs
- xiv. Slave PLCs
- xv. DEC Alpha SCADA servers
- xvi. DEC Hubs
- xvii. SCADA workstations
- xviii. Mimic boards (train status boards)
- xix. —DIGITAL□ printers and monitors

It is our understanding that the contractor shall furnish a new state of the art SCADA system, and that the SCADA field equipment essentially stays in place. Please clarify the exact scope of the SCADA deliverable

A23. MDT confirms that the SCADA field equipment stays in place.

Section 01 10 00 1.5 para. H item "x. replace" refers to the central control equipment listed in items xi through xix. Item xiv refers to the slave PLCs at central connected to the Master PLC.

Refer to Contract Drawings DWG. 006 through DWG 010 (provided in Addendum #3) which shows the existing system and the proposed work.

Q24. Addendum 4 addresses the facility issues and a tour for the main office building. Just as important is a thorough understanding of the field equipment to be replaced and instrumented. Can a tour be conducted of the stations identifying the station equipment locations to be instrumented for station SCADA and provide a tour of the existing RTUs / PLCs that will be replaced? Better cost estimates can be made for the replacement/upgrades for the field equipment, by having better information on the equipment location and accessibility.

- A24. The facility tour will include the SPCC 3rd floor which houses the Metrorail Government Center Station Train Control and related PLC/SCADA equipment which is typical of the other Metrorail Station's field equipment. However the proposer should understand that no field PLC/RTU are to be replaced under any agreement issued as a result of this solicitation.
- Q25. Reference: "Attachment D, Proposer Information", requires prime bidders to prequalify in two categories "Mass Transit Program (Systems) Management" and "Engineering Construction Management". Having a single bidder prequalify for both of these diverse qualifications seemingly limits the number of qualified companies from proposing as Prime and could exclude a number of qualified systems providers.
We request a small change to the requirement to open the opportunity to more bidders and competition, by making this requirement applicable for 'the Prime bidder or prime bidder's Team to prequalify in these two categories.
Or that the Technical Qualification requirement "17.00 Engineering Construction Management" be moved from the Prime Proposer level in the Subcontractor requirement level.
Would MDT consider making this change to capture the experience they are looking for but to garner more qualified bids for their evaluation?
- A25. Technical certification requirement were modified via this addendum, refer to Modification No. 3 and Attachment No. 6.
- Q26. Reference: Volume 16. Exhibit G1-Task 3.1.42.pdf - 16782 2.2. SYSTEM SOFTWARE states:
The system software shall include a real-time operating system and device input/output programs. Operating system software supplied by the CPU manufacturer shall not be modified without written authorization from the MDT. The capabilities of the software shall include....
Question:
This requirement seems to point to the operating system as being 'real time' vs. the outputs and events operating in a real time manner. Many of today's control center systems rely on Windows based operating systems to provide the speed, functionality, upgrade capability and user interfaces required for a modern control center system. Operating systems such as Windows, Unix, etc are not technically classified as real time operating systems. Given that Windows is a widely accepted operating system for use in metro/transit train control and SCADA systems, will MDT accept a proposal with Windows as its operating system for system software, to be evaluated, based on the proposal criteria in the RFP - assuming of course that system software meets the performance and operating requirements of the specification?
- A26. Yes, MDT will consider and evaluate a Windows based operating system.
- Q27. Would MDT grant a 4-week extension to the due date of July 7, 2010? The new requested due date would be August 4, 2010. The extension is requested to allow us time to certify technical qualifications with Miami Dade as outlined in "Attachment D, Proposer Information", teams to form and time to allow us to prepare a quality and responsive bid for MDT.
- A27. No time extension to the current proposal submittal granted at this time.
- Q28. Would MDT provide a copy of its tax-exempt certification so that bidders may assess what materiel and taxes are exempt and those items that need to be included?
- A28. Miami-Dade County is exempt from all taxes (Federal, State, and Local). Given that there is no tax on sales to business that will resell to a consumer, in this case MDC, provided via this addendum as attachment No. 8 - Consumer's Certificate of Exemption # 85-8012621859C-3 to be used only for the purchase of materials required for this project.
- Q29. Reference:

Attachment A - Technical Specifications Section 01 10 00, 3.3 Systems Design and Documentation, para. A.
This section defines two (2) required Design Phases: Preliminary Design and Final Design

This appears to be in contradiction with the following section:

Attachment A - Technical Specifications

Section 01 33 00,

1.7 Design Packages, para. A, B, C

This section defines three (3) required Design Phase Submittals: Conceptual Design, Preliminary Design and Final Design

A29. A Conceptual Design is to be submitted with the proposal as described in RFP Attachment D.

Preliminary Design and Final Design shall be submitted per Attachment A, Section 01 10 00, 3.2 "Architectural Design and Documentation" and 3.3 "Systems Design and Documentation, para. A"

Within Attachment A - Technical Specifications, Section 01 33 00, Delete Subsections 1.17.A, B and C.

Q30. In document "24. MDT Compendium of Design Criteria -MRCC" reference is made to much equipment which "is to be installed" but does not appear in "2. Attachment A Tech Spec Part 1" nor "3. Attachment A Tech Spec Part 2".

An example of this is in page 27 of "Vol 7 Ch 7 Communications Interim Draft-2April09-INTERIM RE.pdf" which states that:

"...Color Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) cameras are to be installed at each station for security to cover ..."

We understand that equipment so referenced in the design criteria are not part of the scope of this project but refer to existing equipment or future acquisitions. Please can you confirm that this understanding is correct?

A30. The intent of the MDT Compendium of Design Criteria is to cover all MDT projects, as such, it includes additional information which may not be applicable to this specific project. RFP item #2. Attachment A Tech Spec Part 1 and item #3. Attachment A Tech Spec Part 2 specifications contain the requirements specific to this project.

Q31. In document "24. MDT Compendium of Design Criteria -MRCC" reference is made to much equipment which "is to be installed" but does not appear in "2. Attachment A Tech Spec Part1" nor "3. Attachment A Tech Spec Part2".

An example of this is in page 27 of "Vol 7 Ch 7 Communications Interim Draft-2April09- INTERIM RE.pdf" which states that:

"...Color Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) cameras are to be installed at each station for security to cover ..."

We understand that equipment so referenced in the design criteria are not part of the scope of this project but refer to existing equipment or future acquisitions. Please can you confirm that this understanding is correct?

A31. Yes - Your understanding is correct. The intent of the MDT Compendium of Design Criteria is to cover all MDT projects; as such it includes additional information which may not be applicable to this specific project. RFP Attachment A Tech Spec Part 1 and Attachment A Tech Spec Part 2 specifications contain the requirements specific to this project.

Q32. If you would be so kind to clarify the following:

Does a proposer also have to submit an Affirmative Action Plan in order to propose on the subject solicitation?

A32. For Companies that are not offering services as Professional Engineers, Architects, Landscape Architects or Land Surveyors/Mapping an approved AAP is required for all vendors interested in contracting with Miami-Dade County prior to contract award in accordance with Ordinance 98-30, Ordinance 82-37 and Section 2-8.1.5 of the Code of Miami-Dade County. For proposal purposes it is not required to have an approved AAP.

- Q33. If so, do our subcontractors also have to provide both a Vendor Registration Package and Affirmative Action Plan as well.
- A33. For Companies that are not offering services as Professional Engineers, Architects, Landscape Architects or Land Surveyors/Mapping an approved AAP is required for all vendors interested in contracting with Miami-Dade County prior to contract award in accordance with Ordinance 98-30, Ordinance 82-37 and Section 2-8.1.5 of the Code of Miami-Dade County, the administration of the project should decide if the subcontractors must abide by this requirement or not. For the professional services projects (Engineers, Architects, Landscape Architects or Land Surveyors/Mapping) is required that both the prime and the subcontractor have the PQC approved (vendor registration, technical certification and affirmative action plan).

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment # 1 - Electronic Sign Information System Specifications
Attachment #2 - Metrorail Operations Rules and Procedures Manual
Attachment #3 - MDT MIC-EHT Contract Division 50 - Technical Provision
Attachment #4 - MDT FEP Database MDT 416_2DP - Central MTU MODBUS Read/Write Database
Attachment #5 - Form B1- Price Proposal Schedule
Attachment #6 - Attachment "D"
Attachment #7 - Metrorail Central Control Upgrade Project Cost Estimate
Attachment #8 - Consumer's Certificate of Exemption # 85-8012621859C
Attachment #9 - General Provisions for the Construction Phase of the Central Control Upgrade
Attachment #10 - Copy of Attendance Sheet for Site Visit.

All other information remains the same.

Miami-Dade County

Andrew Zawoyski, CPPO

Andrew Zawoyski, CPPO
Contracting Officer

cc: Clerk of the Board
B. Libhaber, Assistant County Attorney